REMARKS

Summary

Claims 1-6, 10-36, and 38-43 were pending. Claims 1, 15, 18, 21-22, 25, 30, 35, and 39 are amended. No new matter has been added.

Accordingly, claims 1-6, 10-36, and 38-43 are pending and under consideration.

Rejections of Claims 1-6, 10-11, 18, 21-22, 25-27, 30-32, 35-36, and 39-41 Under 35 USC 103

Claims 1-6, 10-11, 18, 21-22, 25-27, 30-32, 35-36, and 39-41 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over US Patent No. 6,415,294 issued to Niemi (Niemi) in view of US Patent No. 6,510,406 issued to Marchisio (Marchisio) and further in view of US Patent No. 6,519,585 to Kohli (Kohli). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The method of claim 1 automatically assembles and augments the first information page browsed with one or more information source identifiers directly identifying one or more additional information pages with second contents that may be additionally retrieved, the one or more directly identified additional information pages selected based at least in part on second keywords different from but determined to be related to first keywords present in the first information page, the first and second keywords present in a list established prior to the retrieving and displaying of the first information page, the list comprising keywords relating the second keywords to the first keywords and provisioned based on established categories of keywords, the second contents directly augmenting the first content.

When viewed as a whole, claim 1 provides features not taught or suggested by the cited art. The references fail to teach or suggest at least one feature of claim 1, and thus claim 1 is patentable over the cited art.

Niemi discloses a method of developing a list of keywords present in documents viewed by a client system over time (see Table 1 and Column 8, lines 39-48 of Niemi). Niemi builds a database of documents viewed on the client

13

system, creates a dynamic database of keywords contained in those documents using a probabilistic measure, and then embeds search queries into all keywords present in newly-downloaded documents. When selected by a user, the queries generate a list of all previously-viewed documents that also include the selected keyword along with an overall similarity calculation. The similarity calculation is a measure of the total number of keywords the two documents have in common. In claim 1, the first and second keywords are different, thus the method provides for augmentation of content, not simply a cross-reference to other documents containing the same keywords as a subject document. Niemi fails to teach other features of claim 1 as at least partially admitted in the Office Action.

Marchisio fails to remedy the deficiencies of Niemi. Marchisio discloses allowing a user to select any term in a downloaded webpage to bring about the dynamic generation of related keywords (see Marchisio column 16, lines 38-58 and Figure 9). The relationship between the selected term and the related keywords is not identified in a pre-established list; rather the secondary terms are dynamically generated based on probability algorithms after a keyword is selected from a first downloaded webpage. Marchisio identifies secondary terms that have a certain degree of similarity to a keyword. Claim 1 does not require that the second keywords have some minimum similarity to the first keyword, but rather the provided second keywords must be present in the established list and are thereby related to the first keyword.

At page 3, the Office Action acknowledges that Marchisio generates a list of secondary terms after a first keyword is identified. The secondary terms and their relationship to the keyword selected from the downloaded page are thus determined by the algorithm after the keyword has been selected. By contrast, claim 1 recites that the first and second keywords are present in a list established prior to the retrieving and displaying of the first information page, the list comprising keywords relating the second keywords to the first keywords and provisioned based on established categories of keywords. In Marchisio, the secondary terms are generated after the webpage is viewed, and the relationship between the keyword

and the secondary terms is also identified after the webpage is viewed.

The Office Action further indicates that "[a]s long as the list is established and utilized for additional search inquiries as taught in Marchisio, then the list reads on the claimed term." However, no such teaching is provided in Marchisio. Rather, Marchisio teaches that the generation of a list of secondary terms is a dynamic process that is conducted at the time a keyword is selected. For example, Column 5, lines 27-31, indicates that "the disclosed system, in response to each new query input by the user, determines a new lexical transform space, based on algebraic and computational principles. . . ."

Marchisio fails to teach other features of claim 1 as at least partially admitted in the Office Action.

Kohli fails to remedy the deficiencies of Marchisio and Niemi. Kohli provides a search engine that provides relevant search categories in response to the submission of a particular search term. As noted at Column 4, lines 59-62, "[t]he system **9** of FIG. 1 allows a user to search for three types of Yellow Pages information: categories, business names, and brands. A category specifies a specific type of goods or services." Thus, in response to a search query, the system may return categories to the user, which simply relates to the hierarchical level of the search (category, business, etc.). However, in claim 1, the list relates second keywords to first keywords and the list is provisioned based on established categories of keywords. Thus, the categories impact the list and/or keywords that comprise the list. Claim 1 thus provides a relational list/database in which first keywords are related to second keywords, which may be further categorized, features not taught or suggested by Kohli.

For at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Niemi, Marchisio, and Kohli fails to teach or suggest all elements of amended claim 1 and that claim 1 is therefore patentable over the cited references.

Independent claims 18, 21, 25, 30, 35, and 39 recite similar elements as claim 1. Thus, for at least the same reasons as claim 1, Applicant submits that claims 18, 21, 25, 30, 35, and 39 are also patentable over the cited references.

Claims 2-6, 10-11, 26-27, 31-32, 36, and 40-41 depend from claims 1, 25, 30, 35, and 39, respectively. Thus, for at least the reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-6, 10-11, 26-27, 31-32, 36, and 40-41 are also patentable over the cited references.

Rejections of Claims 12-17, 19-20, 23-24, 28-29, 33-34, 38, and 42 Under 35 USC 103

Claims 12-17, 19-20, 23-24, 28-29, 33-34, 38, and 42 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Niemi in view of Marchisio and Kohli and in further view of US Patent No. 6,271,840 issued to Finseth et al (Finseth).

Claims 12-14, 19-20, 23-24, 28-29, 33-34, 38, and 42 depend from claims 1, 18, 21, 25, 30, 35, and 39, respectively. As discussed above, Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over the combination of Niemi, Marchisio, and Kohli. Finseth fails to remedy the above-cited deficiencies of Niemi, Marchisio, and Kohli. Thus, for at least the reasons cited above in relation to claim 1, Applicant submits that claims 12-14, 19-20, 23-24, 28-29, 33-34, 38, and 42 are patentable over the cited references.

Independent claim 15 recites similar elements as claim 1. Further, claims 16 and 17 depend from claim 15. Thus, for at least the same reasons cited above, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 15-17 are patentable over the combination of Niemi, Marchisio, Kohli, and Finseth.

Rejection of Claim 43 Under 35 USC 103

Claim 43 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Niemi in view of Marchisio and Kohli and in further view of US Patent No. 6,141,010 issued to Hoyle (Hoyle).

Claim 43 depends from claim 1 and thus is patentable over the combination of Niemi, Marchisio, and Kohli for at least the reasons discussed above. Hoyle fails to remedy the above-cited deficiencies of Niemi, Marchisio, and Kohli. Thus, for at least the reasons cited above in relation to claim 1, Applicant submits that claim 43 is patentable over the cited references.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-6, 10-36, and 38-43 are in condition for allowance and early issuance of the Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner has any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (503) 796-2844. Please charge any shortages and credit any overages to Deposit Account No. 500393.

Respectfully submitted,

SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.

Dated: __October 24, 2008__

/Steven J. Prewitt/
Steven J. Prewitt
Registration No. 45,023

Pacwest Center, Suites 1600-1900
1211 SW Fifth Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204
Telephone: 503.796.2844